

## **SUMMARY**

The above Amendment and following Remarks are responsive to the points raised in the January 28, 2004 Office Action. In the Office Action, claims 6-8 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-4 and 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by McManigal (U.S. Patent No. 5,253,051). Claims 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McManigal. Upon entry of this Amendment, the specification will have been amended to correct a typographical error, claims 2, 5-9, and 12 will have been amended, claims 1, 3-4, 10-11, and 13 will have been canceled, claims 14-31 will have been added, and claims 2, 5-9, 12, and 14-31 will be pending in this application. Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

## **REMARKS**

### **OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a):**

The drawings were rejected under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention in the claims. Specifically, the Examiner stated:

“Therefore, the features, “a display signal” and a [“]display signal source”, of claim 1, “a digital display signal” of claims 10 and 13, “an analog display signal” of claims 11 and 12, “a plurality of sashes” of claim 4, “at least a portion of the window extends beyond the frame perimeter” of claim 6, and “the entire window extends beyond the frame perimeter” of claims 7 and 8, must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).”

In response, claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, and 13 have been canceled rendering moot the objection to claims 1, 4, 10-11, and 13. The objections to claims 6-8 are traversed since Fig. 1 shows the movement of window 135 in the direction H into the wall and tab remaining within the frame

perimeter. Claim 12 has been rewritten and the objection listed above no longer applies.

Applicant requests removal of the drawing objections applied to Fig. 1.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH:**

Claims 6-8 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants traverse these rejections.

Although the Applicants have made minor amendments to claims 6-8 and 12, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph are improperly applied and do not require amendment of claims 6-8 or 12 to address. Specifically, claims 6-8 are fully supported by both the specification and Fig. 1, which provide that window 135 is slidable in the direction H into the wall adjacent the window frame. Tab 150 is shown extending into the frame when the window 135 is slid entirely into the wall. Regarding claim 12, the assertions made by the Examiner are clearly improper. Conventional systems are capable of receiving digital and analog display signals. Although the amendments to claim 12 clarify the capability of the display module, original claim 12 is fully supported by the specification and Fig. 1. Therefore, since the disclosure adequately supports the features of claims 6-8 and 12, Applicants request removal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections as improper.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):**

Claims 1-4 and 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McManigal. Claims 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

McManigal. Since these rejections are based on the same reference, they will be addressed together. Applicants traverse these rejections.

Since Claims 1, 3-4, 10-11, and 13 have been canceled by the present Amendment, these rejections generally are moot as applied. Claims 14-31 have been added and include elements that are not taught or suggested by McManigal. For example, independent claim 14 specifies that the window is capable of receiving a display signal and is capable of permitting viewing through the wall of the structure. McManigal does not teach or suggest such capabilities and rejections based thereupon cannot be maintained against claims 14-31. Accordingly, Applicants request removal of the rejections based on McManigal and issuance of a notice of allowance of pending claims 2, 5-9, 12, and 14-31.

### **CONCLUSION**


Claims 2, 5-9, 12, and 14-31 are believed allowable and a notice to such effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding the foregoing Amendment and response, he is invited and urged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required for the timely consideration of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09-0528.

Respectfully Submitted,

Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC  
P.O. Box 7037  
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037  
Tel: (404) 872-7000  
Fax: (404) 888-7490

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Keats A. Quinalty  
Registration No. 46,426  
Steven D. Kerr  
Registration No. 32,472